arXiv:0901.4168v2 [math.NT] 31 Mar 2010

USING INDICES OF POINTS ON AN ELLIPTIC CURVE TO CONSTRUCT A DIOPHANTINE MODEL OF $\mathbb{Z}$ AND DEFINE $\mathbb{Z}$ USING ONE UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIER IN VERY LARGE SUBRINGS OF NUMBER FIELDS, INCLUDING $\mathbb{Q}$

ALEXANDRA SHLAPENTOKH

ABSTRACT. Let K be a number field such that there exists an elliptic curve E of rank one over K. For a set $\mathscr{W}_K$ of primes of K, let $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} = \{x \in K : \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x \geq 0, \forall \mathfrak{p} \not\in \mathscr{W}_K\}$. Let $P \in E(K)$ be a generator of $E(K)$ modulo the torsion subgroup. Let $(x_n(P), y_n(P))$ be the affine coordinates of $[n]P$ with respect to a fixed Weierstrass equation of E. We show that there exists a set $\mathscr{W}_K$ of primes of K of natural density one such that in $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ multiplication of indices (with respect to some fixed multiple of P) is existentially definable and therefore these indices can be used to construct a Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$. We also show that $\mathbb{Z}$ is definable over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ using just one universal quantifier. Both, the construction of a Diophantine model using the indices and the first-order definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ can be lifted to the integral closure of $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ in any infinite extension K_∞ of K as long as $E(K_\infty)$ is finitely generated and of rank one.

1. INTRODUCTION

The interest in constructing Diophantine models of $\mathbb{Z}$ over various rings and related issues of Diophantine decidability and definability over rings goes back to a question that was posed by Hilbert: given an arbitrary polynomial equation in several variables over $\mathbb{Z}$, is there a uniform algorithm to determine whether such an equation has solutions in $\mathbb{Z}$? This question, otherwise known as Hilbert's Tenth Problem, has been answered negatively in the work of M. Davis, H. Putnam, J. Robinson and Yu. Matijasevich. (See [5], [6] and [14].) Since the time when this result was obtained, similar questions have been raised for other fields and rings. In other words, if R is a recursive ring, then, given an arbitrary polynomial equation in several variables over R, is there a uniform algorithm to determine whether such an equation has solutions in R? One way to resolve the question of Diophantine decidability negatively over a ring of characteristic 0 is to construct a Diophantine definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ over such a ring. This notion is defined below.

Definition 1.1. Let R be a ring and let $A \subset R^k, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then we say that A has a Diophantine definition over R if there exists a polynomial

$$f(t_1, \ldots, t_k, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in R[t_1, \ldots, t_k, x_1, \ldots, x_n]$$

Date: April 1, 2010.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11U05; Secondary 11G05.

Key words and phrases. Hilbert's Tenth Problem, elliptic curve, Diophantine definition, First-Order Definition.

The research for this paper has been partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0650927 a grant from John Templeton Foundation. The author would also like to thank Bjorn Poonen for his help.

such that for any $\bar{t} \in R^k$,

$$\exists x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R, f(t_1, \ldots, t_k, x_1, ..., x_n) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow \bar{t} \in A.$$

If the quotient field of R is not algebraically closed, we can allow a Diophantine definition to consist of several polynomials without changing the nature of the relation. (See [6] for more details.)

The usefulness of Diophantine definitions stems from the following easy lemma.

Lemma 1.2. *Let $R_1 \subset R_2$ be two recursive rings such that the quotient field of R_2 is not algebraically closed. Assume that Hilbert's Tenth Problem (abbreviated as "HTP" in the future) is undecidable over R_1, and R_1 has a Diophantine definition over R_2. Then HTP is undecidable over R_2.*

Using norm equations, Diophantine definitions have been obtained for $\mathbb{Z}$ over the rings of algebraic integers of some number fields. Jan Denef has constructed a Diophantine definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ for the finite degree totally real extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$. Jan Denef and Leonard Lipshitz extended Denef's results to all the extensions of degree 2 of the finite degree totally real fields. Thanases Pheidas and the author of this paper have independently constructed Diophantine definitions of $\mathbb{Z}$ for number fields with exactly one pair of non-real embeddings. Finally Harold N. Shapiro and the author of this paper showed that the subfields of all the fields mentioned above "inherited" the Diophantine definitions of $\mathbb{Z}$. (These subfields include all the abelian extensions.) The proofs of the results listed above can be found in [7], [9], [8], [19], [27], and [29].

The author modified the norm method to obtain Diophantine definitions of $\mathbb{Z}$ for "large" subrings of totally real number fields (not equal to $\mathbb{Q}$) and their extensions of degree 2. (See [31], [32], [34], [36].) Further, again using norm equations, the author also showed that in some totally real infinite algebraic extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$ and extensions of degree 2 of such fields one can give a Diophantine definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ over integral closures of "small" and "large" rings, though not over the rings of algebraic integers. (The terms "large" and "small" rings will be explained below in Definition 1.4.)

Using elliptic curves Bjorn Poonen has shown the following in [23].

Theorem 1.3. *Let M/K be a number field extension with an elliptic curve E defined over K, of rank one over K, such that the rank of E over M is also one. Then O_K (the ring of integers of K) is Diophantine over O_M.*

Cornelissen, Pheidas and Zahidi weakened somewhat assumptions of Poonen's theorem. Instead of requiring a rank 1 curve retaining its rank in the extension, they require existence of a rank 1 elliptic curve over the bigger field and an abelian variety over the smaller field retaining its positive rank in the extension (see [1]). Further, Poonen and the author have independently shown that the conditions of Theorem 1.3 can be weakened to remove the assumption that the rank is one and require only that the rank in the extension is positive and the same as the rank over the ground field (see [37] and [22]). Following Denef in [9], the author also considered the situations where elliptic curves had finite rank in infinite extensions and showed that when this happens in a totally real field one can existentially define $\mathbb{Z}$ over the ring of integers of this field and the ring of integers of any extension of degree 2 of such a field (see [38]).

Recently, in [18], Mazur and Rubin showed that if Shafarevich-Tate conjecture held over a number field K, then for any cyclic extension M of K, there existed an elliptic curve of rank one over K, keeping its rank over M. Combined with Theorem 1.3, this new result showed that Shafarevich -Tate conjecture implied HTP is undecidable over the rings of integers of any number field. Similar consequences can be derived for big rings in any number field.

Perhaps the most prominent open question in the subject is the Diophantine status of $\mathbb{Q}$. As indicated above, one way to show unsolvability of HTP over $\mathbb{Q}$ would be to construct a Diophantine definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. A Diophantine definition is a type of a Diophantine model. Given two recursive rings R_1 and R_2 we say that R_2 has a Diophantine model of R_1 if there exists an injective and recursive map $\phi : R_1 \longrightarrow R_2$ sending Diophantine sets to Diophantine sets. If R_1 has undecidable Diophantine sets, then so does R_2. Therefore, any recursive ring with a Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$ has undecidable Diophantine sets and thus HTP is unsolvable over this ring.

It is also not hard to show that given an injection ϕ of $\mathbb{Z}$ into a recursive ring R, it is enough to show that the images of the graphs of addition and multiplication are Diophantine over R, in order to conclude that ϕ is a Diophantine model. An old plan for constructing a Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ involved elliptic curves of rank one (see [21]). More specifically let E be an elliptic curve defined and of rank one over $\mathbb{Q}$. Fix an affine Weierstrass equation for E, as well as a generator Q. Let r be the size of the torsion group and let $P = [r]Q$. Let $(x_n(P), y_n(P))$ be the coordinates of $[n]P$ derived from our fixed affine Weierstrass equation. Now for $n \neq 0$ send n to y_n. It is easy to see that the graph of addition is Diophantine over $\mathbb{Q}$, but it is not clear what happens to the graph of multiplication. This plan has another potentially fatal complication: Mazur's conjectures (see [15], [16], [17]). As was shown in [3], if Mazur's conjecture on topology of rational points holds, there is no Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. It is precisely these difficulties preventing the resolution of the problem over $\mathbb{Q}$ that motivated the investigation of Diophantine definability and decidability over "large" or "big" rings. These rings can be found in any number field and we define them below.

Definition 1.4. Let K be a number field and let $\mathscr{W}_K$ be a set of primes of K. Define $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ to be the following ring:

$$O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} := \{x \in K : \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x \geq 0, \ \forall \mathfrak{p} \notin \mathscr{W}_K\}.$$

If $\mathscr{W}_K$ is infinite we will call these rings "big" or "large". If $\mathscr{W}_K$ is finite we refer to the corresponding rings as "small". Such rings are also known as the rings of $\mathscr{S}$-integers.

Perhaps the most significant result concerning big rings was obtained by Poonen in [24]. In this paper he showed that there exists a big ring inside $\mathbb{Q}$ where the set of primes allowed in the denominator is of natural density one and the ring possesses a Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$. To carry out his construction, Poonen modeled integers by approximation. More specifically in [24] he proved the following. Let E be a curve of rank one over $\mathbb{Q}$ without complex multiplication and with only one connected component. Let P be a generator of $E(\mathbb{Q})$. Then for some set $\mathscr{W}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of rational primes of natural density one, we have that $E(O_{K,\mathscr{W}_{\mathbb{Q}}}) = \{(x_{\ell_i}, y_{\ell_i}), i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \cup \{$ finite set $\}$, where (x_n, y_n) are the coordinates of

$[n]P$ obtained from a fixed affine Weierstrass equation of E. Further it is also the case that $|y_{\ell_i} - i| < 10^{-i}$ for all positive integers i. Later in [26], this result was lifted to all number fields with rank one elliptic curves (also including curves with complex multiplication) though construction of the model proceeded along a different path but still using a subsequence of coordinates (x_{ℓ_i}, y_{ℓ_i}).

In this paper we resurrect in a manner of speaking the old plan of modeling $\mathbb{Z}$ using the indices of points on an elliptic curve but only over a big ring. More precisely we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5. *Let K be a number field. Let E be an elliptic curve defined and of rank one over K. Let P be a generator of $E(K)$ modulo the torsion subgroup, and fix an affine Weierstrass equation for E of the form $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, with $a, b \in O_K$, where O_K is the ring of integers of K. Let (x_n, y_n) be the coordinates of $[n]P$ derived from this Weierstrass equation. Then there exists a set of K-primes $\mathscr{W}_K$ of natural density one, and a positive integer m_0 such that the following set $\Pi \subset O^{12}_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ is Diophantine over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.*

$$(U_1, U_2, U_3, X_1, X_2, X_3, V_1, V_2, V_3, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \in \Pi \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\exists \textit{ unique } k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \textit{ such that } \left(\frac{U_i}{V_i}, \frac{X_i}{Y_i}\right) = (x_{m_0 k_i}, y_{m_0 k_i}), \textit{ for } i = 1, 2, 3, \textit{ and } k_3 = k_1 k_2.$$

We can use this result to construct yet another variation of a Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 1.6. Let R be a countable recursive ring, let $D \subset R^k, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, be a Diophantine subset, and let $\approx$ be a (Diophantine) equivalence relation on D, i.e assume that the set $\{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : \bar{x}, \bar{y} \in D, \bar{x} \approx \bar{y}\}$ is a Diophantine subset of R^{2k}. Let $D = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} D_i$, where D_i is an equivalence class of $\approx$, and let $\phi : \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \{D_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be defined by $\phi(i) = D_i$. Finally assume that the sets

$$Plus = \{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) : \bar{x} \in D_i, \bar{y} \in D_j, \bar{z} \in D_{i+j}\}$$

and

$$Times = \{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) : \bar{x} \in D_i, \bar{y} \in D_j, \bar{z} \in D_{ij}\}$$

are Diophantine over R.

Then we will say that R has a *class* Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$.

It is clear that if R does have a class Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$ then HTP is not solvable over R. Such a model of $\mathbb{Z}$ has been used already to show Diophantine undecidability of function fields of positive characteristic (see [10], [12], [20], [28], [30], [33]).

As a corollary of Theorem 1.5 we immediately obtain the following statement.

Corollary 1.7. *In the notation above, for $n \neq 0$ let $\phi(n) = [(U_{m_0 n}, X_{m_0 n}, V_{m_0 n}, Y_{m_0 n})]$, the equivalence class of $(U_{m_0 n}, X_{m_0 n}, V_{m_0 n}, Y_{m_0 n})$ under the equivalence relation described below, where $U_{m_0 n}, X_{m_0 n}, V_{m_0 n}, Y_{m_0 n} \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}, V_{m_0 n} Y_{m_0 n} \neq 0$, and $(x_{m_0 n}, y_{m_0 n}) = \left(\frac{U_{m_0 n}}{V_{m_0 n}}, \frac{X_{m_0 n}}{Y_{m_0 n}}\right)$. Let $\phi(0) = \{(0, 0, 0, 0)\}$. Then ϕ is a class Diophantine model of $\mathbb{Z}$. (Here if $V \hat{V} \hat{Y} Y \neq 0$ we set $(U, X, V, Y) \approx (\hat{U}, \hat{X}, \hat{V}, \hat{Y})$ if and only if $\frac{\hat{U}}{\hat{V}} = \frac{U}{V}$ and $\frac{\hat{X}}{\hat{Y}} = \frac{X}{Y}$.)*

Using Theorem 1.5 we also prove the following.

Theorem 1.8. *Let K be a number field. Let E be an elliptic curve defined and of rank one over K. Then there exists a set $\mathscr{W}_K$ of primes of K of natural density one such that $\mathbb{Z}$ is first-order definable over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ using just one universal quantifier.*

This result is an improvement of the first-order definability results for big rings in [2] and [25], where the first-order definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ was given using just one universal quantifier over big rings contained in $\mathbb{Q}$ in [25] and in some number fields in [2] with the natural density of the inverted primes arbitrarily close but not equal to one. (We should also note here that the main result of [25] is defining $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ using two universal quantifiers.) The result of this paper is also a natural complement to the results of [4] where it was shown that a model of $\mathbb{Z}$ can be defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ using just one universal quantifier provided a certain conjecture on elliptic curves is true.

Finally, Theorem 1.5 allows us to simplify some results concerning infinite extensions from [38]. The result of Theorem 1.5 holds for any algebraic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ with a rank 1 finitely generated elliptic curve. No additional assumptions are required. In the past we needed some way to define integrality at a prime in an infinite extension to use this kind of elliptic curve technique.

We finish this section with a notation set to be used in the rest of the paper.

Notation 1.9.
- Let $\mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$ denote the set of rational primes.
- Let K be a number field.
- Let $\mathscr{P}_K$ be the set of all finite primes of K.
- Given $x \in K$, let $\mathfrak{n}(x) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{p}^{\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x}$, where the product is taken over all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}_K$ such that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x > 0$. Let $\mathfrak{d}(x) = \mathfrak{n}(x^{-1})$.
- Let $\mathscr{W}_K \subset \mathscr{P}_K$ (we will make $\mathscr{W}_K$ more specific in the next section).
- Let $A, B \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$. Then we will say that $(A, B)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1$ if for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}_K \setminus \mathscr{W}_K$ we have that either $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} A = 0$ or $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B = 0$.
- Let $A, B \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$. Then we will say that $A\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} B$ if for all $\mathfrak{p} \notin \mathscr{W}_K$ we have that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B \geq \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} A$ or in other words A divides B in the ring $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.
- Let h_K be the class number of K. (See [11], Chapter I, §4 for the definition of a class number.)
- Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ be two integral divisors of K. Then we will say that $\mathfrak{A}\Big|\mathfrak{B}$ to mean that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}(K)$ we have that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{A} \leq \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{B}$.
- Suppose $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ are two divisors of K with $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}^j$. Then we set $\sqrt[j]{\mathfrak{B}} = \mathfrak{A}$.

2. AN OUTLINE OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

Let K be a number field with an elliptic curve of rank 1. The key to the proof of Theorem 1.5, that is the key to the construction of a big subring of K where the theorem holds, is the choice of K-primes to invert in the ring. In [24] and [26] the inverted primes were chosen so that only a specific sequence of the elliptic curve points had its coordinates in the ring. (We remind the reader that an element of our number field is in the ring if and only if all the primes occurring in the denominator of its divisor are inverted in the ring.) In our case, almost no point of the elliptic curve will have its coordinates in the ring and we will have to represent each coordinate by a pair consisting of a "numerator" and the corresponding "denominator". This is the reason for having a class Diophantine model at the end instead of a regular Diophantine model: every coordinate of an elliptic curve point will be represented by an equivalence class of pairs of "numerators" and "denominators", as in a standard construction of the fraction field of a ring.

To explain the main ideas of the proof we for the moment simplify the situation assuming that $K = \mathbb{Q}$, there are no torsion points, and every non-trivial multiple of the generator P has a primitive divisor. In other words we assume that for every $n > 0$, there exists a prime dividing the reduced denominators of the affine coordinates of $[n]P$ such that this prime does not divide the reduced denominators of the coordinates of any $[m]P$ with $0 < m < n$. (In general this will be true for sufficiently large n only. See Proposition 4.4.) We will also assume that the coordinates of P itself are non-zero integers. (In "real life" we will invert the primes which appear in the denominator of the coordinates of P. Also the primitive divisor requirement and the chosen form of the Weierstrass equation will force all the non-trivial multiples of P to have non-zero coordinates.) Under our assumptions we can represent $[n]P$ for a non-zero integer n, as a pair $\left(\frac{U_n}{V_n}, \frac{X_n}{Y_n}\right)$, where $U_n \neq 0, V_n > 0, X_n \neq 0, Y_n > 0$ are integers and $(U_n, V_n) = 1, (X_n, Y_n) = 1$. Later we will not be able to assume that U_n, V_n, X_n, Y_n are integers but only that these are elements of our big ring. However, we will able to treat the variables ranging over the big rings almost in the same way as if they were integers.

From [24] (see Proposition 4.3, Lemma 4.7, and Lemma 4.9 in this paper) we know that

$$\text{if } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \text{ with } m|n, \text{ then } V_m|V_n \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}, \text{ and conversely if } V_m|V_n \text{ in } \mathbb{Z} \text{ then } m|n, \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\text{if } k, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, \text{ then all the primes occurring in } (V_k, V_m) \text{ occur in } V_{(k,m)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $(V_k, V_m) = \text{GCD}(V_k, V_m)$ and $(k, m) = \text{GCD}(k, m)$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. (Since we assumed that every non-trivial multiple of P has a primitive divisor, we do not have to worry about k and m being large enough.) Given our assumptions on the coordinates of P, we have that $V_1 = 1$, and if $(k, m) = 1$, then $(V_k, V_m) = 1$. Thus, if k and m are non-zero relatively prime integers, then $V_k V_m | V_{km}$. Unfortunately, in general V_{km} does not divide $V_k V_m$. In particular, V_{km} is divisible by some prime powers which do not occur in V_k and V_m. *So the main idea behind the proof is to invert these extra primes to force* V_{km} *to divide* $V_k V_m$ *in the resulting ring.* Of course we have to leave enough primes uninverted so that (2.1) still holds in the ring.

We now describe the primes we do not invert. For each rational prime p and any positive integer ℓ we keep *uninverted* the largest primitive divisor of $[p^\ell]P$. We call these primes *indicator primes*. (The idea that the indicator primes are enough to identify uniquely positive multiples of a generator was first investigated in [2].) We invert all the other primes and denote by R the resulting subring of $\mathbb{Q}$. Observe that for $m = \prod p_i^{\ell_i}$, we have that V_m is divisible by the indicator prime of each $[p_i^\ell]P$ for all i and all $\ell = 1, \ldots, \ell_i$, and, because of (2.2), by no other indicator primes. Indeed, first suppose q is an indicator prime V_{p^r}, where $p \neq p_i$ for any i. In this case by (2.2), q divide $V_{(p^r,m)} = V_1 = 1$ and we have a contradiction. Next assume that q is an indicator prime for some $V_{p_i^r}$, where $r > \ell_i$. By definition of an indicator prime we have that $q|V_{p_i^r}$ but q does not divide $V_{p_i^j}$ for any $j \in \{1,\dots,r-1\}$. Applying (2.2) again we obtain $q|V_{(p^r,m)} = V_{p^{\ell i}}$ contradicting our assumptions in this case also.

So now we are in a situation where for $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ and relatively prime, V_kV_m and V_{km} are divisible by the same uninverted primes. Unfortunately, there is one more point to take care of. The indicator primes do not necessarily appear to the same power in V_k, V_m and V_{km} (see Lemma 4.5 in this paper). However in the case of $\mathbb{Q}$ the difference in powers is at most 2 (in the general case one can bound this difference by twice the degree of the field over $\mathbb{Q}$, but we will avoid all the cases where the power can go up by more than 2.) Let $q \neq p$ be rational primes.

(2.3) If $\operatorname{ord}_q V_m > 0$, then $\operatorname{ord}_q V_{pm} = \operatorname{ord}_q V_m$, and $\operatorname{ord}_q V_{qm} = 2 + \operatorname{ord}_q V_m$.

Observe that for $t = p$ or $t = q$ we have that $\operatorname{ord}_q V_{tm} \leq 3 \operatorname{ord}_q V_m$ since

$$\operatorname{ord}_q V_{tm} \leq 2 + \operatorname{ord}_q V_m \leq 3 \operatorname{ord}_q V_m,$$

as by assumption $\operatorname{ord}_q V_m \geq 1$. Now we can conclude that that if $(V_k, V_m)_R = 1$ it is the case that $V_{km}|_R V_k^3 V_m^3$ in our ring. (Here for $A, B \in R$ we write "$(A,B)_R = 1$" to mean that the reduced numerators of A and B are not simultaneously divisible by any non-inverted prime, and we write "$A|_R B$" to indicate the divisibility in the ring, i.e. the fact that $\frac{B}{A} \in R$.) To summarize the discussion above we can now say

$$(k,m) = 1 \Longrightarrow \forall n : (V_n|_R V_m^3 V_k^3 \wedge V_m V_k|_R V_n \Leftrightarrow |n| = |km|).$$

(See Proposition 4.15 and Lemma 4.17.)

If $(k,m) = 1$, we say that the indices k and m can be "multiplied directly". Note also that for *any* triple of non-zero indices k, m and n we have that

$$V_n|_R V_m^3 V_k^3 \text{ and } V_m V_k|_R V_n \text{ implies } |n| = |km|. \tag{2.4}$$

(As above, the divisibility bar with a subscript R here refers to the divisibility in our ring.) Further, as a general matter, for any ring of characteristic not equal to 2, to define multiplication, it is enough to define squaring: $xy = \frac{1}{2}((x+y)^2 - x^2 - y^2)$. Observe also that for any $k \neq 0$ we can always multiply k and $k+1$ directly. We use this fact to define squaring of an index: given an index $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$, we require that for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ it is the case that

$$V_k V_{k+1}|_R V_s \wedge V_s|_R V_k^3 V_{k+1}^3 \tag{2.5}$$

or, in other words,

$$|(k+1)k| = |s| \tag{2.6}$$

If not for absolute values in (2.6), we would be done, since we would be able to define a square of k by subtracting k from s. We deal with absolute values via considering all possible cases and using (2.1) in Lemma 5.10.

Over $\mathbb{Z}$, given integers $U > 0, V > 0, X \neq 0, Y \neq 0$ such that $\frac{U}{V}$ and $\frac{X}{Y}$ satisfy the chosen Weierstrass equation and such that $(U,V) = 1, (X,Y) = 1$, we can conclude that $(U,V,X,Y) = (U_n, V_n, X_n, Y_n)$ for some unique $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$. Unfortunately, if we now assume that $(U > 0, V > 0, X \neq 0, Y \neq 0) \in R^4$, where R is, as above, our ring with infinitely many primes inverted, and $\frac{U}{V}$ and $\frac{X}{Y}$ satisfy the chosen Weierstrass equation with $(U,V)_R = 1, (X,Y)_R = 1$, then we will be able to conclude only that $U = \tilde{U}_n = U_n\bar{U}_n, V = \tilde{V}_n =$

$V_n\bar{V}_n$, where $\bar{U}_n, \bar{V}_n$ are rational numbers whose reduced numerators and denominators are divisible by the inverted primes only. (A similar conclusion will apply to (X, Y).) However, since we are only interested in the divisibility by the non-inverted indicator primes, the "bar" parts do not matter or in other words, for any $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ we still have that

$$(k, m) = 1 \Longrightarrow \forall n : (\tilde{V}_n |_R \tilde{V}_m^3 \tilde{V}_k^3 \wedge \tilde{V}_m \tilde{V}_k |_R \tilde{V}_n \Leftrightarrow |n| = |km|).$$

This is so, because $(k, m) = 1 \Longleftrightarrow (\tilde{V}_k, \tilde{V}_m)_R = 1$ and $\tilde{V}_n |_R \tilde{V}_m^3 \tilde{V}_k^3 \Longleftrightarrow V_n |_R V_m^3 V_k^3$, etc. The fact that we can express the condition of being relatively prime in our ring in polynomial terms is demonstrated in Lemma 5.2. Unfortunately, when the underlying field has a class number greater than one, there are other technical complications requiring raising variables to the power divisible by a class number to obtain relatively prime numerators and denominators. (See Notation 5.3, Item 3 and Remark 5.4.)

The last point that needs to be explained is the density of the inverted and the non-inverted prime sets. In [24] and [26], it was shown that the natural density of the indicator primes corresponding to the prime multiples of any infinite order point is 0. So the only remaining question is the density of the indicator primes corresponding to prime power multiples of such a point, when the power is at least 2. This density is also 0 and the corresponding calculation is much easier. It was first carried out in [2] and is reproduced in the appendix of this paper for the convenience of the reader.

3. AN OUTLINE OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.8.

In this section we keep for the moment the simplifying assumptions and notation of the preceding section, i.e. we assume that we are dealing with a rank one elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$ with a trivial torsion group, and a Weierstrass equation as above, and that every non-trivial multiple of a generator has a primitive divisor. We also assume that Theorem 1.5 holds or in other words in a big subring R of $\mathbb{Q}$ described above we have defined existentially multiplication of indices.

If $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $x = \dfrac{A}{B}$, where $A, B \in R$ with $AB \neq 0$, then we say that A and B are a reduced numerator and a denominator respectively, if $(A, B)_R = 1$. In other words, neither A, nor B are divisible by "extra" non-inverted primes. If $R = \mathbb{Z}$, this definition is the same as the usual one. We now need the following results from [23] (Lemmas 4.8 and 4.18 of this paper):

(3.7)

"For any sufficiently large $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ we have that

the reduced denominator of x_l divides the reduced numerator of $\left(\dfrac{x_l}{x_{kl}} - k^2\right)^2$ in $\mathbb{Z}$",

and

(3.8) "For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ there exists $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that n divides the reduced denominator of x_l in $\mathbb{Z}$".

Now let z be an arbitrary element of our big ring with the following property: there exists a non-zero integer k, such that for all rational numbers b in our ring, there exist non-zero integers i and j satisfying the equations (3.9)–(3.11) below.

(3.9) b^2 divides the reduced denominator of x_i in our ring.

$$j = ik \tag{3.10}$$

$$\begin{gathered}\text{The reduced denominator of } x_i \\ \text{divides the reduced numerator of } (z - \frac{x_i}{x_j})^2 \text{ in our ring.}\end{gathered} \tag{3.11}$$

(Here, as above, x_k, x_i, x_j are the x-coordinates of $[k]P, [i]P$ and $[j]P$ respectively.) Then $z \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Conversely, if z above is a square of a non-zero integer, then we can find a $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ such that for every b in our big ring there exist i and j so that (3.9) – (3.11) are satisfied.

First assume that z, a rational number in our ring, is fixed. Let k be the corresponding non-zero integer, b an arbitrary element of the ring and assume that $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ are such that the equations above are satisfied. From (3.7) and (3.9) we conclude that b divides the reduced numerator of $\left(\frac{x_i}{x_j} - k^2\right) = \left(\frac{x_i}{x_{ik}} - k^2\right)$ as well as the reduced numerator of $(z - \frac{x_i}{x_j}) = (z - \frac{x_i}{x_{ik}})$ in our ring. Thus, b divides the reduced numerator of $z - k^2$ in our ring. If $z = \frac{z_1}{z_2}$, where $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$, then b divides $z_1 - z_2k^2$ in our ring. If we pick b to be divisible by q^m, where q is a prime which is not inverted in our ring and m is a positive integer large enough so that $q^m > |z_1 - z_2k^2|$, then q^m divides $z_1 - z_2k^2$ in $\mathbb{Z}$ and the only way the divisibility condition can hold is for $z_1 = z_2k$. Without loss of generality we can assume that z_1 and z_2 were picked to be relatively prime in $\mathbb{Z}$, and since k is a non-zero integer, we must conclude that $z_2 = 1$, and $z = z_1 = k^2$.

Assume now that $z = k^2$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$. Let b be any rational number in our ring. Let $i > 0$ be such that b^2 divides the reduced denominator of x_i and i is sufficiently large so that (3.7) holds for $l = ik$. Such an i exists by (3.8). Finally let $j = ik$ and observe that (3.11) now holds by (3.7).

4. ELLIPTIC CURVES

We now proceed with the detailed description of the proof. In this section we lay down the elliptic curve foundations of our results. Many of the technical details in this section are taken from [2], [23], [24] and [26]. Below we indicate which technical results have been taken from other papers.

Notation and Assumptions 4.1. We add the following notation and assumptions to the list above.

- Let E be an elliptic curve of rank 1 defined over K (in particular, we assume such an E exists).
- We fix a Weierstrass equation $W : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$ for E with all the coefficients in the ring of integers of K.
- Let $E(K)_{\text{tors}}$ be the torsion subgroup of $E(K)$.
- Let t be a multiple of $\#E(K)_{\text{tors}}$.
- Let $Q \in E(K)$ be such that Q generates $E(K)/E(K)_{\text{tors}}$.
- Let $P := [t]Q$.

- Let $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{bad}} = \mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{bad}}(W, P, K) \subseteq \mathscr{P}_K$ consist of the primes that ramify in $K/\mathbb{Q}$, the primes for which the reduction of the chosen Weierstrass model is singular (this includes all primes above 2), and the primes at which the coordinates of P are not integral.
- For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ write $[n]P = (x_n, y_n) = (x_n(P), y_n(P))$ where $x_n, y_n \in K$.
- For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$, let the divisor of $x_n(P)$ be of the form
$$\frac{\mathfrak{a}_n}{\mathfrak{d}_n}\mathfrak{b}_n = \frac{\mathfrak{a}_n(P)}{\mathfrak{d}_n(P)}\mathfrak{b}_n(P)$$
where
  - $\mathfrak{d}_n = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}^{-a_{\mathfrak{q}}}$, where the product is taken over all primes $\mathfrak{q}$ of K not in $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{bad}}$ such that $a_{\mathfrak{q}} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}} x_n < 0$.
  - $\mathfrak{a}_n = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}^{a_{\mathfrak{q}}}$, where the product is taken over all primes $\mathfrak{q}$ of K not in $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{bad}}$ such that $a_{\mathfrak{q}} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}} x_n > 0$.
  - $\mathfrak{b}_n = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}^{a_{\mathfrak{q}}}$, where the product is taken over all primes $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{bad}}$ and $a_{\mathfrak{q}} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}} x_n$.
- For n as above, let $\mathscr{S}_n = \mathscr{S}_n(P) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}_K : \mathfrak{p} | \mathfrak{d}_n\}$. By definition of $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{bad}}$ and $\mathfrak{d}_n$, we have $\mathscr{S}_1 = \emptyset$.
- For $\ell \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, define a_ℓ to be the smallest positive integer such that for any $j \geq a_\ell$ we have that $\mathscr{S}_{\ell^j} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j-1}} \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 4.4 below, for all but finitely many primes ℓ we have that $a_\ell = 1$.
- For $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, let $\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^j}(P) = \mathfrak{p}_{\ell^j}$ be a prime of the largest norm in $\mathscr{S}_{\ell^j} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j-1}}$, if such a prime exists. (This prime will be called the indicator prime for $[\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^j}](P)$.)
- Let $m_0 = \prod_{a_\ell > 1} \ell^{a_\ell - 1}$. (Note that m_0 is well defined since, as we have observed above, for all but finitely many primes ℓ we have that $a_\ell = 1$.)
- For all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ let $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} = \mathfrak{p}_{\ell^{j + \operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}}$.
- Let $T = [m_0]P$.
- Let $\mathscr{V}_K = \mathscr{V}_K(P) = \{\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^j} : \ell \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$.
- Let $\mathscr{W}_K = (\mathscr{P}_K \setminus \mathscr{V}_K) \cup \mathscr{S}_{m_0}$. ($\mathscr{W}_K$ will be the set of the inverted primes.)
- Let $\mathscr{C}_n = (\mathscr{S}_n \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0}$. Note that $\mathscr{C}_{m_0} = \emptyset$. ($\mathscr{C}_n$ will be the collection of the prime factors of the "n"-th denominator which are not inverted.)
- Let $\mathscr{X}_n = \mathscr{S}_{m_0 n}$. ($\mathscr{X}_n$ will be the set of the "not-bad denominator primes" for $[n]T$.)
- Let $\mathscr{Y}_n = \mathscr{C}_{m_0 n}$ and observe that $\mathscr{Y}_1$ is empty. ($\mathscr{Y}_n$ will be the set of the non-inverted "denominator" primes for $[n]T$.)
- Let $\mathfrak{c}_n = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}^{-a_{\mathfrak{q}}}$, where the product is taken over all primes $\mathfrak{q}$ of K not in $\mathscr{W}_K$ such that $a_{\mathfrak{q}} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}} x_n < 0$. (The divisor $\mathfrak{c}_n$ will be the non-inverted part of the "n"-th denominator.)
- Let $\mathfrak{f}_n = \mathfrak{c}_{m_0 n}$.
- For $x \in K$, let $\mathfrak{d}(x) = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}^{-a_{\mathfrak{q}}}$, where the product is taken over all primes $\mathfrak{q}$ of K such that $a_{\mathfrak{q}} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}} x < 0$. Let $\mathfrak{n}(x) = \mathfrak{d}(x^{-1})$.
- For $x \in K$, let $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x) = \prod_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}^{-a_{\mathfrak{q}}}$, where the product is taken over all primes $\mathfrak{q}$ of K not in $\mathscr{W}_K$ such that $a_{\mathfrak{q}} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}} x < 0$. Let $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x) = \mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x^{-1})$.

Below we combine ideas from [23], [26] and [2] to show that it is enough to have one non-inverted indicator prime for every prime power of the index to identify the index of a point uniquely (up to a sign). At the same time, if we don't invert only the indicator primes of the index prime powers, we will have "almost" arranged for the multiplication of indices.

As pointed out above, denominator prime sets are not enough to establish a sign of an index. This is demonstrated by the lemma below.

Lemma 4.2. *For any* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ *we have that* $\mathscr{S}_n = \mathscr{S}_{-n}$*,*$\mathscr{C}_n = \mathscr{C}_{-n}$*,* $\mathscr{X}_{-n} = \mathscr{X}_n$*,* $\mathscr{Y}_{-n} = \mathscr{Y}_n$*, and* $\mathfrak{f}_n = \mathfrak{f}_{-n}$*.*

Proof. Given the choice of our Weierstrass equation, we have that $x_{-n} = x_n$. ☐

Our next step is to establish several important properties of the primes which appear in the denominators in Propositions 4.3–4.14. Fortunately for us, most of the technical work has already been done elsewhere.

Proposition 4.3 (Lemma 3.1 of [26])**.** *Let* $\mathfrak{R}$ *be an integral divisor of* K*. Then*

$$\{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} : \mathfrak{R} \mid \mathfrak{d}_n(P)\} \cup \{0\}$$

is a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}$*.*

Proposition 4.4 (Proposition 3.5 of [26])**.** *There exists* $C > 0$ *such that for all* $\ell, m \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *with* $\max(\ell, m) > C$ *we have that* $\mathscr{S}_{\ell m} \setminus (\mathscr{S}_\ell \cup \mathscr{S}_m) \neq \emptyset$*.*

Lemma 4.5. *Let* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$*. Suppose that* $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathscr{P}_K$ *divides* $\mathfrak{d}_n$*, and* $p \geq 2$ *is a rational prime.*

(1) *If* $\mathfrak{t} \mid p$*, then* $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{d}_{pn} = 2 + \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{d}_n$*.*
(2) *If* $\mathfrak{t} \nmid p$*, then* $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{d}_{pn} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{d}_n$*.*

Proof. The proof of the lemma is almost identical to the proof of Lemma 3.3 of [26] except for the fact that we allow $p = 2$. We also remind the reader that any $\mathfrak{t}$ dividing $\mathfrak{d}_n$ is automatically not in $\mathscr{S}_{\text{bad}}$ and therefore is not dyadic, ramified over $\mathbb{Q}$ or is among primes at which our Weierstrass model has a bad reduction.

Remark 4.6. As was explained in Section 2, in either case, $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{d}_{pn} \leq 3 \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{d}_n$.

☐

Corollary 4.7. *Let* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$*. Suppose that* $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathscr{P}_K$ *divides* $\mathfrak{c}_n$ *(or* $\mathfrak{f}_n$*), and* $p \geq 2$ *is a rational prime.*

(1) *If* $\mathfrak{t} \mid p$*, then* $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{c}_{pn} = 2 + \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{c}_n$ *(or* $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{f}_{pn} = 2 + \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{f}_n$*).*
(2) *If* $\mathfrak{t} \nmid p$*, then* $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{c}_{pn} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{c}_n$ *(or* $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{f}_{pn} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{f}_n$*).*

Proof. The corollary follows immediately from the lemma above if we note that we obtain $\mathfrak{c}_n$ from $\mathfrak{d}_n$ by removing factors of $\mathfrak{d}_n$ which are in $\mathscr{W}_K$, and $\mathfrak{f}_n = \mathfrak{c}_{m_0 n}$. ☐

Lemma 4.8 (Lemma 10 of [23])**.** *Let* $\mathfrak{A}$ *be any integral divisor of* K*. Then there exists* $k \in \mathbb{Z} > 0$ *such that* $\mathfrak{A} \Big| \mathfrak{d}(x_k)$*.*

Lemma 4.9. *Let* $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$*, and let* (m, n) *be their GCD. Then*

$$\mathscr{S}_m \cap \mathscr{S}_n = \mathscr{S}_{(m,n)},$$
$$\mathscr{X}_m \cap \mathscr{X}_n = \mathscr{X}_{(m,n)},$$
$$\mathscr{C}_m \cap \mathscr{C}_n = \mathscr{C}_{(m,n)},$$

and

$$\mathscr{Y}_m \cap \mathscr{Y}_n = \mathscr{Y}_{(m,n)}.$$

In particular, if $(m,n)=1$*, then*

$$\mathscr{S}_m \cap \mathscr{S}_n = \emptyset,$$
$$\mathscr{X}_m \cap \mathscr{X}_n = \mathscr{X}_1 = \mathscr{S}_{m_0},$$
$$\mathscr{C}_m \cap \mathscr{C}_n = \mathscr{C}_1 = \emptyset,$$

and

$$\mathscr{Y}_m \cap \mathscr{Y}_n = \mathscr{C}_{m_0} = \emptyset.$$

Proof. The assertion $\mathscr{S}_m \cap \mathscr{S}_n = \mathscr{S}_{(m,n)}$ is exactly Lemma 3.2 of [26]. Therefore if $(m,n)=1$ we have that $\mathscr{S}_{(m,n)} = \mathscr{S}_1 = \emptyset$ by definition of $\mathscr{S}_n$. Further, by definition,

$$\mathscr{X}_n = \mathscr{S}_{m_0 n}, \mathscr{X}_m = \mathscr{S}_{m_0 n}$$

and therefore,

$$\mathscr{X}_m \cap \mathscr{X}_n = \mathscr{S}_{m_0 n} \cap \mathscr{S}_{m_0 m} = \mathscr{S}_{m_0 (m,n)} = \mathscr{X}_{(m,n)}.$$

Thus, if $(m,n)=1$ we have

$$\mathscr{X}_m \cap \mathscr{X}_n = \mathscr{X}_1 = \mathscr{S}_{m_0}.$$

Also by definition,

$$\mathscr{C}_n = (\mathscr{S}_n \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0}, \mathscr{C}_m = (\mathscr{S}_m \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0}$$

and therefore,

$$\mathscr{C}_n \cap \mathscr{C}_m = (\mathscr{S}_m \cap \mathscr{S}_n \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0} = (\mathscr{S}_{(m,n)} \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0} = \mathscr{C}_{(m,n)}.$$

Consequently, if $(m,n)=1$ we have that

$$\mathscr{C}_m \cap \mathscr{C}_n = \mathscr{C}_1 = (\mathscr{S}_1 \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0} = \emptyset.$$

Finally, again by definition,

$$\mathscr{Y}_n = \mathscr{C}_{m_0 n}, \mathscr{Y}_m = \mathscr{C}_{m_0 m}$$

and therefore,

$$\mathscr{Y}_n \cap \mathscr{Y}_m = \mathscr{C}_{m_0 n} \cap \mathscr{C}_{m_0 m} = \mathscr{C}_{m_0 (m,n)} = \mathscr{Y}_{(m,n)}.$$

Consequently, if $(m,n)=1$ we have that

$$\mathscr{Y}_m \cap \mathscr{Y}_n = \mathscr{Y}_1 = \mathscr{C}_{m_0} = (\mathscr{S}_{m_0} \cap \mathscr{V}_K) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{m_0} = \emptyset.$$

□

Corollary 4.10. *For any* $\ell \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ *and any* $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ *we have that* $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j}$ *exists, and* $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} \in \mathscr{X}_k = \mathscr{S}_{km_0}$ *if and only if* ℓ^j *divides* k*. (We remind the reader that by definition,* $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} = \mathfrak{p}_{\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell(m_0)}}$ *is the indicator prime of* $[\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}]P$*.)*

Proof. By definition of $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j}$, to establish its existence it is enough to show that

$$\mathscr{S}_{\ell^{\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0 + j}} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j-1+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} \neq \emptyset.$$

At the same time, from the definitions of m_0 and a_ℓ we have that

$$\mathscr{S}_{\ell^{\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0 + j}} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j-1+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} = \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{a_\ell - 1 + j}} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j-1+a_\ell-1}} \neq \emptyset,$$

and therefore $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j}$ exists.

Now suppose $j > 0$ and $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} \in \mathscr{X}_k = \mathscr{S}_{km_0}$. Then by definition of $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j}$, we have that

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} \in \mathscr{S}_{km_0} \cap \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} = \mathscr{S}_{GCD(km_0,\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0})} \subseteq \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{\operatorname{ord}_\ell(km_0)}}$$

by Lemma 4.9. But by the same lemma $\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} \in \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{\operatorname{ord}_\ell(km_0)}}$ if and only if $j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell k$.

Conversely, suppose $j > 0$ and $j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell k$. Then $\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} \in \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{j+\operatorname{ord}_\ell m_0}} \subset \mathscr{S}_{km_0}$ by Lemma 4.9 once again and $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} \in \mathscr{X}_k$. □

Corollary 4.11. (1) *For any* $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ *we have that*

$$\mathscr{Y}_k = \{\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} : \ell \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}, 0 < j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell k\}.$$

(2) *For* $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ *we have that* $\mathscr{Y}_k \subseteq \mathscr{Y}_n$ *if and only if* $k\Big|n$.

(3) *For* $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ *we have that* $\mathfrak{f}_k\Big|\mathfrak{f}_n$ *if and only if* $k\Big|n$.

(4) *For* $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ *we have that* $(k, n) = 1$ *if and only if* $(\mathfrak{f}_k, \mathfrak{f}_n) = (1)$, *where* (1) *is a trivial divisor.*

Proof. (1) First we observe that by definition of $\mathscr{Y}_k = \mathscr{C}_{m_0k} = \mathscr{S}_{m_0k} \setminus \mathscr{W}_K = \mathscr{X}_k \setminus \mathscr{W}_K$, these prime sets contain only the primes of the form $\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^j}$ for some $\ell \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and some $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Secondly, by Corollary 4.10, we also have that $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^j} \in \mathscr{X}_k$ if and only if $0 < j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell k$.

(2) If we assume that $k\Big|n$, then $\mathscr{X}_k \subseteq \mathscr{X}_n$ by Lemma 4.9 and consequently, $\mathscr{Y}_k \subseteq \mathscr{Y}_n$. Conversely, if we suppose that $\mathscr{Y}_k \subset \mathscr{Y}_n$, then for every rational prime ℓ we have that $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell^{\operatorname{ord}_\ell(k)}} \in \mathscr{Y}_n$ by Part 1 of this corollary. Thus, by Part 1 again, for every rational prime ℓ we have that $\ell^{\operatorname{ord}_\ell(k)}\Big|n$. Consequently k divides n.

(3) If we first assume that $\mathfrak{f}_k\Big|\mathfrak{f}_n$, then $\mathscr{Y}_k \subseteq \mathscr{Y}_n$ and $k\Big|n$ by Part 2 of this corollary. Next if we suppose $k\Big|n$, then $\mathscr{Y}_k \subseteq \mathscr{Y}_n$ by Part 2 of this corollary again, and consequently $\mathfrak{f}_k\Big|\mathfrak{f}_n$ by Corollary 4.7.

(4) Suppose $(k, n) = 1$, then $\mathscr{Y}_k \cap \mathscr{Y}_n = \emptyset$ by Corollary 4.9. Since all the prime divisors of $\mathfrak{f}_k$ are in $\mathscr{Y}_k$, and all the prime divisors of $\mathfrak{f}_n$ are in $\mathscr{Y}_n$, we must conclude that $(\mathfrak{f}_k, \mathfrak{f}_n) = (1)$. Conversely, if $(\mathfrak{f}_k, \mathfrak{f}_n) = (1)$, then $\mathscr{Y}_k \cap \mathscr{Y}_n = \emptyset = \mathscr{Y}_{(k,n)}$, where the last equality holds by Corollary 4.9. But from Corollary 4.10, we conclude that $(k, n) = 1$ since $\mathscr{Y}_1$ is the only $\mathscr{Y}_m$ with $m > 0$ which is an empty set.

□

The next corollary is the first step towards the existential definition of multiplication of indices.

Corollary 4.12. *Let* $m, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ *with* $(m, k) = 1$. *Then* $\mathscr{Y}_{mk} = \mathscr{Y}_m \cup \mathscr{Y}_k$

Proof. Since $(m, k) = 1$ the assertion follows from the Part 1 of Corollary 4.11 since for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ we have that $0 < j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell mk$ if and only if either $0 < j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell m$ or $0 < j \leq \operatorname{ord}_\ell k$. □

While we established already that the denominator prime sets cannot distinguish between positive and negative indices, the result below tells us that the indicator primes identify the *absolute value* of the index for a multiple of T uniquely.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be such that $\mathscr{Y}_{n_1} = \mathscr{Y}_{n_2}$. Then $n_1 = n_2$,*

Proof. By Corollary 4.11 we have that n_1 divides n_2 and n_2 divides n_1. Thus, $n_1 = n_2$. ☐

From Corollary 4.13 we immediately obtain the proposition below.

Corollary 4.14. *Let $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be such that $\mathfrak{f}_{n_1} = \mathfrak{f}_{n_2}$. Then $n_1 = n_2$,*

Proof. The equality $\mathfrak{f}_{n_1} = \mathfrak{f}_{n_2}$ implies $\mathscr{Y}_{n_1} = \mathscr{Y}_{n_2}$ and we are done by Corollary 4.13. ☐

We are now ready to conclude that under our definitions and under certain relative primality assumptions, the denominator of the product is “almost” equal to the product of the denominators.

Proposition 4.15. *If $m, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with $(m,k) = 1$, then $\mathfrak{f}_{mk} | \mathfrak{f}_k^3 \mathfrak{f}_m^3$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}_K$ be such that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{f}_{mk} > 0$. Then by Corollary 4.12 either $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{f}_m > 0$ or $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{f}_k > 0$, but both inequalities cannot hold at the same time since $(k, m) = 1$. (See Lemma 4.9.) Without loss of generality, assume the first alternative holds, and therefore by Corollary 4.7 and Remark 4.6 we have that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{f}_{mk} \leq 3 \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{f}_m$. ☐

Definition 4.16. If $m, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ are such that $(m, k) = 1$, then we will say that m and k *can be multiplied directly*.

The next lemma is a converse of sorts to the Proposition 4.15.

Lemma 4.17. *Let $m, k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $(\mathfrak{f}_k, \mathfrak{f}_m) = (1)$, $\mathfrak{f}_n | \mathfrak{f}_k^3 \mathfrak{f}_m^3$, and $\mathfrak{f}_m \mathfrak{f}_k | \mathfrak{f}_n$. Then $(k, m) = 1$, and $n = mk$.*

Proof. First we show that $(k, m) = 1$. Suppose not. Let ℓ divide (m, k). Then $\mathfrak{q}_\ell \in \mathscr{Y}_m \cap \mathscr{Y}_k$ and $(\mathfrak{f}_k, \mathfrak{f}_m) \neq (1)$. Thus $(k, m) = 1$ and by assumption and Corollary 4.12 we now have that $\mathscr{Y}_n = \mathscr{Y}_k \cup \mathscr{Y}_m = \mathscr{Y}_{mk}$. By Corollary 4.13 we conclude that $n = mk$. ☐

The remaining Propositions 4.18 – 4.22 of this section will be necessary for defining integers using just one universal quantifier. We start with a lemma which allows us to generate integers.

Lemma 4.18 (Lemma 11 of [23]). *There exists a positive integer m_1 such that for any positive integers l, k,*

$$\mathfrak{d}(x_{lm_1}) \Big| \mathfrak{n} \left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}} - k^2 \right)^2 \tag{4.1}$$

in the integral divisor semigroup of K.

Remark 4.19. If we restrict our attention to the non-inverted primes only, we can rewrite (4.1) as

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1}) \Big| \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K} \left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}} - k^2 \right)^2 \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.20. *With m_1 as in Lemma 4.18, $(\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1}), \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})) = (1)$ in the integral divisor semigroup of K.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.9 it follows that $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})$ divides $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})$ and by definition $(\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1}), \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})) = (1)$. ☐

From Lemma 4.18 and Lemma 4.20 we also deduce the following corollary.

Corollary 4.21.

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}^{h_K}}{x_{klm_1}^{h_K}}-k^{2h_K}\right)^2$$

Proof. From an elementary algebra calculation we have

$$\frac{x_{lm_1}^{h_K}}{x_{klm_1}^{h_K}}-k^{2h_K}=\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}-k^2\right)\sum_{r=0}^{h_K-1}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}\right)^{h_K-1-r}k^{2r},$$

and therefore

$$\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}-k^2\right)\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(\frac{x_{lm_1}^{h_K}}{x_{klm_1}^{h_K}}-k^{2h_K})\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(\sum_{r=0}^{h_K-1}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}\right)^{h_K-1-r}k^{2r}).$$

However, the only primes which can appear in

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(\sum_{r=0}^{h_K-1}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}\right)^{h_K-1-r}k^{2r})$$

are the primes occurring in

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}\right).$$

The non-inverted part of the divisor of $\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}$ is equal to $\frac{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})}$, where $\frac{\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})}{\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})}$ is an integral divisor by Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.5. This leaves only primes from $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{klm_1})$ in the denominator. Since none of these primes is present in $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})$ due to Lemma 4.20, we have that

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}^{h_K}}{x_{klm_1}^{h_K}}-k^{2h_K}\right)^2\Leftrightarrow$$

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left[\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}-k^2\right)^2\left(\sum_{r=0}^{h_K-1}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}\right)^{h_K-1-r}k^{2r}\right)^2\right]\Leftrightarrow\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{lm_1})\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x_{lm_1}}{x_{klm_1}}-k^2\right)^2$$

□

Lemma 4.22. *For any* $k\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ *we have that* $\mathfrak{d}(x_k)$, $\mathfrak{d}_k$ *are squares of some integral divisors of* K.

Proof. From the Weierstrass equation $y^2=x^3+ax+b$ we have that for any prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of K, if $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}x<0$, then $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x^3+ax+b)=\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}x^3<0$ and $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}y<0$ implying that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}x\equiv 0 \mod 2$. □

5. DIOPHANTINE DEFINITION OF MULTIPLICATION ON INDICES

We start with a basic fact and some easy lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *The set* $\{x \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} : x \neq 0\}$ *is Diophantine over* $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$. *(See Definition 2.2.3 and Proposition 2.2.4 of* [35].*)*

We now use the fact that we can define the set of non-zero integers of our ring to define relative primality over the ring.

Lemma 5.2. *The set* $\mathtt{R} = \{(A,B) \in O^2_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} : AB \neq 0 \wedge (A,B)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1\}$ *is Diophantine over* $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.

Proof. It is easy to see with the help of the Strong Approximation Theorem that for $(A,B) \in O^2_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ with $AB \neq 0$ the following statements are equivalent

1. $(A,B)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1$
2. $\exists X, Y \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} : XA + YB = 1$

□

Notation 5.3. We define three sets: one to represent the points on our elliptic curve, one to represent the elliptic curve addition, and one to represent the divisors of the denominators:

1. Let
$$\mathtt{E} = \{(U,V,X,Y) \in O^4_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : \frac{U}{V} = x_{m_0 k}, \frac{X}{Y} = y_{m_0 k}\}.$$
For each quadruple (U,V,X,Y) the index $k = k(U,V,X,Y)$ will be unique (since the size of the torsion group divides m_0) and will be called the corresponding (to (U,V,X,Y)) index.
2. Let
$$\mathtt{Plus} = \{(U_1,V_1,X_1,Y_1),(U_2,V_2,X_2,Y_2),(U_3,V_3,X_3,Y_3)\} \subset \mathtt{E}^3$$
consist of triples of quadruples possessing corresponding indices k_1, k_2, k_3 satisfying
$$k_1 + k_2 = k_3.$$
3. Given $(U,V,X,Y) \in \mathtt{E}$, let
$$d(U,V,X,Y) = \{(A,B) \in O^2_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} : \left(\frac{U}{V}\right)^{h_K} = \frac{A}{B}, (A,B)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1\}.$$

Remark 5.4. The reason for defining the set $d(U,V,X,Y)$ is that over an arbitrary number field K we cannot make sure that the numerators and denominators are relatively prime in our ring. Thus a denominator can have "too many" primes in it and the divisibility conditions from Proposition 4.15 can fail if we replace the divisors by the denominators. At the same time, by the definition of the class number, if we raise the x-coordinate to the power equal to the class number, we can obtain a relatively prime numerator and denominator.

Given Lemma 5.2, the following assertion is obvious.

Lemma 5.5. $\mathtt{E}$, $\mathtt{Plus}$*, and* $d(U,V,X,Y)$ *for fixed values of* U,V,X,Y*, are Diophantine over* $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.

The next lemma and its corollary establish a connection between $d(U,V,X,Y)$ and the divisor $\mathfrak{f}_k$ of the corresponding point on the elliptic curve.

Lemma 5.6. *If $(U,V,X,Y) \in \mathtt{E}$, $(A,B) \in d(U,V,X,Y)$, and k is the corresponding index, then for all $\mathfrak{p} \not\in \mathscr{W}_K$ we have that $h_K \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{f}_k = -\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B)$ (Here we remind the reader that $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B)$ is the non-inverted part of the numerator of the divisor of B).*

Proof. By definition of $\mathtt{E}$ and $d(U,V,X,Y)$ we have that $\dfrac{A}{B} = x_{m_0k}^{h_K}$ for the corresponding to (U,V,X,Y) index $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $k > 0$. ("$-k$" gives the same B and the same $\mathfrak{f}_k$ by Lemma 4.2.) Let $\mathfrak{p} \not\in \mathscr{W}_K$ be such that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x_{m_0k} < 0$. Then either $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} A < 0$ or $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B > 0$. The first alternative is impossible because $A \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ and $\mathfrak{p} \not\in \mathscr{W}_K$. Hence we conclude that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B > 0$. Further we also have that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} A = 0$ because otherwise the relative primeness conditions requiring that A and B are not simultaneously divisible by any prime outside $\mathscr{W}_K$ are violated. Now we see that

$$h_K \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x_{m_0k} = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} A - \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B = -\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B.$$

Suppose now that for some $\mathfrak{p} \not\in \mathscr{W}_K$ it is the case that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} x_{m_0k} \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} B > 0$. In this case we also must have that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} A > 0$ which again is impossible since $(A,B)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1$. $\square$

Given the lemma above we immediately conclude the following.

Corollary 5.7. *If $I, I_1 \subset I, I_2 \subset I$ are finite subsets of non-zero integers, $(U_i,V_i,X_i,Y_i) \in \mathtt{E}$, $(A_i,B_i) \in d(U_i,V_i,X_i,Y_i), i \in I$ with k_i being the corresponding indices, then*

$$\left(\prod_{i \in I_1} B_i\right)\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\prod_{i \in I_2} B_i\right) \iff \left(\prod_{i \in I_1} \mathfrak{f}_{k_i}\right)\Big|\left(\prod_{i \in I_2} \mathfrak{f}_{k_i}\right).$$

Next we show that divisibility of indices is Diophantine in our ring.

Lemma 5.8. *If $\mathtt{Divide} = \{(U_1,V_1,X_1,Y_1),(U_2,V_2,X_2,Y_2)\} \subset \mathtt{E}^3$ consists of pairs of quadruples with the corresponding indices k_1 and k_2 such that $k_1|k_2$, then $\mathtt{Divide}$ is Diophantine over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.*

Proof. If $(A_i,B_i) \in d(U_i,V_i,X_i,Y_i), i = 1,2$, then by Corollary 5.7 we have that $B_1\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_2$ if and only if $\mathfrak{f}_{k_1}|\mathfrak{f}_{k_2}$. At the same time by Corollary 4.11, Part 3 and Lemma 4.2, we have that $\mathfrak{f}_{k_1}|\mathfrak{f}_{k_2}$ if and only if $k_1|k_2$. $\square$

We can now define multiplication on the *absolute values* of indices.

Lemma 5.9. *If $(U_i,V_i,X_i,Y_i) \in \mathtt{E}, (A_i,B_i) \in d(X_i,Y_i,U_i,V_i), i = 1,2,3$ with*

$$(B_1,B_2)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1 \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$B_1B_2\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_3 \wedge B_3\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_1^3B_2^3, \tag{5.2}$$

then for the corresponding indices $k_1,k_2,k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ we have that $|k_1||k_2| = |k_3|$.

Proof. If k_i is the index corresponding to (U_i, V_i, X_i, Y_i), then from (5.1), Lemma 4.2, Corollary 4.11, Part 4, and Lemma 5.6 we conclude that $(\mathfrak{f}_{k_1}, \mathfrak{f}_{k_2}) = 1$. Now from Corollary 5.7 and (5.2) it follows that $\mathfrak{f}_{k_1}\mathfrak{f}_{k_2}|\mathfrak{f}_{k_3}$ while $\mathfrak{f}_{k_3}|\mathfrak{f}^3_{k_1}\mathfrak{f}^3_{k_2}$, and the assertion of the lemma is true by Lemma 4.17. □

Our final step in this section is to define a square of an index. This is all we need to define multiplication.

Lemma 5.10. *For any* $(U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1), (U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2), (U_3, V_3, X_3, Y_3), (U_4, V_4, X_4, Y_4) \in \mathtt{E}$ *with the corresponding indices* k_1, k_2, k_3*, and* k_4 *respectively such that*

1. $|k_1| > 4$
2. $k_2 = k_1 + 1$
3. $k_3 \neq 0$
4. $k_4 = k_3 - k_1$
5. $(k_1 - 1)|(k_4 - 1)$

while (5.3) *and* (5.4) *are satisfied, we have that* $k_4 = k_1^2$*.*

Conversely, for any $(U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1), (U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2), (U_3, V_3, X_3, Y_3), (U_4, V_4, X_4, Y_4) \in \mathtt{E}$ *with the corresponding indices* $|k_1| > 4, k_2 = k_1 + 1, k_3 = k_1^2 + k_1, k_4 = k_1^2$*,* (5.3) *and* (5.4) *will be satisfied.*

$$(A_i, B_i) \in d(U_i, V_i, X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \tag{5.3}$$

$$B_1B_2\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_3 \text{ and } B_3\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_1^3B_2^3, \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. First assume that $(U_i, V_i, X_i, Z_i) \in \mathtt{E}, i = 1, \ldots, 4$ with the corresponding indices $k_1, \ldots, k_4$ as above are given and (5.3), (5.4) are satisfied. In this case observe that $(k_1, k_2) = 1$ and therefore by Corollary 4.11 we have that $(\mathfrak{f}_{k_1}, \mathfrak{f}_{k_2}) = 1$. Thus, by Corollary 5.7, we conclude that $(B_1, B_2)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1$. Further, from Lemma 5.9 we can now deduce that $|k_3| = |k_1(k_1 + 1)|$. Consequently, $k_3 = \pm(k_1(k_1 + 1))$. Thus, $k_4 = k_1^2$ or $k_4 = -k_1^2 - 2k_1$. If the second alternative holds, then $(k_1 - 1)|(-k_1^2 - 2k_1)$ and $(k_1 - 1)|3$ which is impossible since $|k_1| > 4$. Thus we must have $k_2 = k_1^2$.

Suppose now that $k_2 = k_1 + 1, k_3 = k_1^2 + k_1$, and $k_4 = k_1^2 - 1$. By Corollary 4.11 we have that $\mathfrak{f}_{k_1}\mathfrak{f}_{k_2}|\mathfrak{f}_{k_3}$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{k_3}|\mathfrak{f}^3_{k_1}\mathfrak{f}^3_{k_2}$. Hence by Corollary 5.7 we can conclude that (5.4) is satisfied by some $B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ which also satisfy (5.3).

□

Lemma 5.8 together with Lemma 5.10 complete the proof of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.7. (The density computation is in the Appendix.)

We finish this section with a new notation to be used below.

Notation 5.11.

- Given $(U_i, V_i, X_i, Y_i) \in \mathtt{E}, i = 1, 2, 3$ we will say that

$$((U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1), (U_2, Y_2, X_2, Y_2), (U_3, Y_3, X_3, Y_3)) \in \Pi$$

to mean that the corresponding indices k_1, k_2, k_3 satisfy $k_3 = k_1k_2$.

- Let

  $$\mathtt{E}_1 = \{(U, V, X, Y) \in O^4_{K,\mathscr{W}_K} \mid \exists \text{ unique } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : \frac{U}{V} = x_{m_1 m_0 k}, \frac{X}{Y} = y_{m_1 m_0 k}\}.$$

  The positive integer m_1 is defined in Lemma 4.18.

6. DEFINING $\mathbb{Z}$ OVER $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ USING ONE UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIER

In this section we use the existential definition of multiplication on indices to give a first-order definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ using just one universal quantifier. We start with a technical lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *If $z \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ has the following property:*

$$\exists U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1, \forall b, \exists U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2, U_3, V_3, X_3, Y_3, A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, B_2, B_3, C$$

(with all the variables ranging over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$) such that

$$(U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1), (U_3, V_3, X_3, Y_3) \in \mathtt{E}, (U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2) \in \mathtt{E}_1, \tag{6.1}$$

$$((U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1), (U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2), (U_3, V_3, X_3, Y_3)) \in \Pi, \tag{6.2}$$

$$(A_i, B_i) \in d(U_i, V_i, X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{6.3}$$

$$b^{2h_K} \mid_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_2, \tag{6.4}$$

$$(A_3 B_2 z - B_3 A_2)^{2h_K} = B_2^{2h_K+1} C, \tag{6.5}$$

then $z \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Conversely, if $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ and $z = z_0^{2h_K}$, then Equations (6.1)–(6.5) *can be satisfied with variables as above ranging over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.*

Proof. From (6.1)–(6.3), we conclude that if k_1, k_2, k_3 are the indices corresponding to (U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1), (U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2), and (U_3, V_3, X_3, Y_3) respectively, then $k_3 = k_1 k_2$, $k_2 \equiv 0 \mod m_1$ and $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_i) = \mathfrak{f}_{k_i}^{h_K}$. Further for the discussion below k_1 is fixed. From equation (6.5), we obtain that

$$\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2^{2h_K+1}) \Big| \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(A_3 B_2 z - A_2 B_3)^{2h_K}$$

and therefore

$$\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2) \Big| \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(A_3 z - \frac{A_2 B_3}{B_2})^{2h_K}$$

Further, since $(B_2, A_3)_{\mathscr{W}_K} = 1$ by Lemma 4.20, we have that

$$\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2) \Big| \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(z - \frac{A_2 B_3}{A_3 B_2})^{2h_K}. \tag{6.6}$$

Thus, since $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2)$ is a $2h_K$-th power of another divisor in K by Lemma 4.22, and by the definition of B_2 we have that

$$\sqrt[2h_K]{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2)} \Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(z - \frac{A_2 B_3}{A_3 B_2}). \tag{6.7}$$

From Corollary 4.21 and Lemma 4.22, since $k_3 = k_1k_2$, and the indices k_2 and k_3 are divisible by m_1, we conclude that

$$\sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{k_2m_1})}\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x^{h_K}_{k_2m_0}}{x^{h_K}_{k_3m_0}} - k_1^{h_K}\right),$$

and therefore, using the definition of B_2, we have

$$\sqrt[2h_K]{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2)}\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{x^{h_K}_{k_2m_0}}{x^{h_K}_{k_3m_0}} - k_1^{h_K}\right).$$

Substituting $\dfrac{A_2B_3}{A_3B_2}$ for $\dfrac{x^{h_K}_{k_2m_0}}{x^{h_K}_{k_3m_0}}$ we obtain

$$\sqrt[2h_K]{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2)}\Big|_{\mathscr{W}_K} \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}\left(\frac{A_2B_3}{A_3B_2} - k_1^{h_K}\right). \tag{6.8}$$

Combining (6.7) and (6.8), we obtain

$$\sqrt[2h_K]{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(B_2)}\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(z - k_1^{2h_K}),$$

and

$$\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(b)\Big|\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(z - k_1^{2h_K}),$$

Since the last divisibility condition has to hold for all b, we must conclude that $z = k_1^{2h_K}$.

Conversely, suppose $z = z_0^{2h_K}$ for $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$. Let $(U_1, V_1, X_1, Y_1) \in \mathtt{E}$ with the corresponding index $k_1 = z_0$. Let $b \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ be given. Let $k_2 \equiv 0 \mod m_1$ be such that $b^2 \mid_{\mathscr{W}_K} \mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{W}_K}(x_{k_2m_0})$. Such an index k_2 exists by Lemma 4.8. Let $(U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2) \in \mathtt{E}$ correspond to k_2. Let $k_3 = k_1k_2$ and let $(U_3, V_3, X_3, Z_3) \in \mathtt{E}$ correspond to the index k_3. Observe that conditions (6.1) and (6.2) are now satisfied. Further note that equation (6.6) holds by Corollary 4.21 and therefore equation (6.5) holds also. □

To deal with the case of an arbitrary non-zero integer we add the following corollary.

Corollary 6.2. *If* $z_0 \in O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ *has the following property:*

$$\begin{gathered}
\exists z_1, \dots, z_{2h_K},\\
\exists U_{1,0}, \dots, U_{1,2h_K}, V_{1,0}, \dots, V_{1,2h_K},\\
\exists X_{1,0}, \dots, X_{1,2h_K}, Y_{1,0}, \dots, Y_{1,2h_K},\\
\forall b,\\
\exists U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2,\\
\exists U_{3,0} \dots U_{3,2h_K}, V_{3,0}, \dots, V_{3,2h_K},\\
\exists X_{3,0}, \dots, X_{3,2h_K}, Y_{3,0}, \dots, Y_{3,2h_K},\\
\exists A_{1,0}, B_{1,0}, \dots, A_{1,2h_K}, B_{1,2h_K}, A_2, B_2, A_{3,0}, B_{3,0}, \dots, A_{3,2h_K}, B_{3,2h_K}, C_0, \dots, C_{2h_K},
\end{gathered}$$

(with all the variables ranging over $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$*) such that*

$$z_j = (z_0 + j)^{2h_K}, j = 0, \dots, 2h_K, \tag{6.9}$$

$$(U_{i,j}, V_{i,j}, X_{i,j}, Y_{i,j}) \in \mathtt{E}, i = 1, 3, j = 0, \dots, 2h_K, \tag{6.10}$$

$$(U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2) \in \mathtt{E}_1, \tag{6.11}$$

$$[(U_{1,j}, V_{1,j}, X_{1,j}, Y_{1,j}), (U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2), (U_{3,j}, V_{3,j}, X_{3,j}, Y_{3,j})] \in \Pi, j = 0, \ldots, 2h_K, \tag{6.12}$$

$$(A_{i,j}, B_{i,j}) \in d(U_{i,j}, V_{i,j}, X_{i,j}, Y_{i,j}), i = 1, 3, j = 0, \ldots, 2h_K, \tag{6.13}$$

$$(A_2, B_2) \in d(U_2, V_2, X_2, Y_2), \tag{6.14}$$

$$b^{2h_K} \mid_{\mathscr{W}_K} B_2, \tag{6.15}$$

$$(A_{3,j}B_2 z_j - B_{3,j}A_2)^{2h_K} = B_2^{2h_K+1} C_j, j = 0, \ldots, 2h_K, \tag{6.16}$$

then $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Conversely, if $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$, *then Equations* (6.9) – (6.16) *can be satisfied with variables as described above ranging over* $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$.

Proof. If the assumptions of the corollary are true, then by Lemma 6.1 we have that

$$z_0^{2h_K}, \ldots, (z_0 + 2h_K)^{2h_K} \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and by Corollary B.10.10 of [35], we have that $z_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$. At the same time, since $z_0^{2h_K} \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have that z_0 is an algebraic integer, and hence in $\mathbb{Z}$. The rest of the proof is analogous to the proof of the second part of Lemma 6.1 □

The last proposition concludes the proof of Theorem 1.8.

7. INFINITE EXTENSIONS

Notation and Assumptions 7.1. We add the following to our assumption list.

- Let K_∞ be a possibly infinite algebraic extension of K.
- Assume $E(K_\infty) = E(K)$.
- Let $O_{K_\infty,\mathscr{W}_{K_\infty}}$ be the integral closure of $O_{K,\mathscr{W}_K}$ in K_∞.

Given the assumptions on our elliptic curve, it is easy to see that the results of the previous section will carry over, and therefore we have the following theorem:

Theorem 7.2. (1) *Let* K *be a number field. Let* E *be an elliptic curve defined and of rank one over* K. *Let* P *be a generator of* $E(K)$ *modulo the torsion subgroup, and fix an affine Weierstrass equation for* E *of the form* $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, *with* $a, b \in O_K$, *where* O_K *is the ring of integers of* K. *Let* (x_n, y_n) *be the coordinates of* $[n]P$ *derived from this Weierstrass equation. Then there exists a set of* K*-primes* $\mathscr{W}_K$ *of natural density one, and a positive integer* m_0 *such that the following set* $\Pi_\infty \subset O^{12}_{K_\infty,\mathscr{W}_{K_\infty}}$ *is Diophantine over* $O_{K_\infty,\mathscr{W}_{K_\infty}}$.

$$(U_1, U_2, U_3, X_1, X_2, X_3, V_1, V_2, V_3, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \in \Pi_\infty \Leftrightarrow$$

$\exists$ *unique* $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ *such that* $\left(\frac{U_i}{V_i}, \frac{X_i}{Y_i}\right) = (x_{m_0 k_i}, y_{m_0 k_i})$ *and* $k_3 = k_1 k_2$.

(2) *For* $n \neq 0$ *let* $\phi_\infty(n) = [(U_n, V_n, X_n, Y_n)]$*, the class of* (U_n, V_n, X_n, Y_n) *under the equivalence relation described below, where* $U_n, V_n, X_n, Y_n \in O_{K_\infty,\mathscr{W}_{K_\infty}}$*,* $Y_nV_n \neq 0$*, and* $(x_{m_0 n}, y_{m_0 n}) = \left(\dfrac{U_n}{V_n}, \dfrac{X_n}{Y_n}\right)$*. Let* $\phi_\infty(0) = \{[0,0,0,0]\}$*. Then* ϕ_∞ *is a class Diophantine model of* $\mathbb{Z}$*. (Here if* $YV \neq 0$ *we have that* $(U,V,X,Y) \approx (\hat{U},\hat{V},\hat{X},\hat{Y})$ *if and only if* $(\dfrac{\hat{U}}{\hat{V}}, \dfrac{\hat{X}}{\hat{Y}}) = (\dfrac{U}{V}, \dfrac{X}{Y})$*.)*

(3) $\mathbb{Z}$ *is definable over* $O_{K_\infty,\mathscr{W}_{K_\infty}}$ *using one universal quantifier.*

8. APPENDIX

In this Appendix we calculate the natural density of $\mathscr{V}_K$. This calculation is similar to the one carried in [2]. We use Notation 4.1 and a new notation: for a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of a number field K we let $\mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p}$ denote the size of the residue field of $\mathfrak{p}$.

Lemma 8.1. *Let* $\ell \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ *and suppose* $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{n+1}} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^n}$ *for some* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*. (Such a* $\mathfrak{p}$ *exists, if* $n \geq a_\ell$*.) Then* $\ell^{n+1} < 3\mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p}$*.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{S}_{\ell^{n+1}} \setminus \mathscr{S}_{\ell^n}$, then $\mathfrak{p}$ does not divide the discriminant of our Weierstrass equation and $\tilde{E}$, the reduction of $E \mod \mathfrak{p}$ is non-singular. Further, x_{ℓ^n}, y_{ℓ^n} are integral at $\mathfrak{p}$, while $\operatorname{ord}_\mathfrak{p} x_{\ell^{n+1}} < 0$, $\operatorname{ord}_\mathfrak{p} y_{\ell^{n+1}} < 0$. Therefore, under the reduction mod $\mathfrak{p}$, the image of $[\ell^n]P$ is not $\tilde{O}$ – the image of O mod $\mathfrak{p}$, while $[\ell^{n+1}]\tilde{P} = \tilde{O}$. Thus we must conclude that $E(\mathbb{F}_\mathfrak{p})$ has an element of order ℓ^{n+1} and therefore $\ell^{n+1} | \#E(\mathbb{F}_\mathfrak{p})$. Let $\#\mathbb{F}_\mathfrak{p} = \mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} = q$. From a theorem of Hasse we know that $\#E(\mathbb{F}_\mathfrak{p}) \leq q + 1 + 2\sqrt{q} \leq 3q$ (see [39], Chapter V, Section 1, Theorem 1.1). ☐

Lemma 8.2. *The natural density of the set* $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^k} : \ell \in \mathscr{P}_\mathbb{Q}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1} \wedge k \geq a_\ell\}$ *is zero.*

Proof. For $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_{\ell^k} \in \mathscr{A}$, the preceding lemma says that $3\mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p}_{\ell^k} > \ell^k$. Thus, since each $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{A}$ corresponds to a distinct pair (ℓ, k) with $\ell \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ with $3\mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} > \ell^k$, we have the following inequality:

$$\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{A} : \mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} \leq X\} \leq \#\{(\ell, k) \in \mathscr{P}_\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Z}_{k \geq 2} : \ell \leq \sqrt[k]{3X}\}$$

Clearly if $\sqrt[k]{3X} < 2$, there will be no prime ℓ with $\ell \leq \sqrt[k]{3X}$. Thus, we can limit ourselves to positive integers k such that $k \leq \log_2(3X)$.

By the Prime Number Theorem (see [13], Theorem 4, Section 5, Chapter XV), for some positive constant C we have that $\#\{\ell \in \mathscr{P}_\mathbb{Q} : \ell \leq X\} \leq CX/\log X$ for all $X \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. From the discussion above we now have the following sequence of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{A} : \mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} \leq X\} &\leq \sum_{k=2}^{\lceil \log_2(3X) \rceil} \#\{\ell \in \mathscr{P}_\mathbb{Q} : \ell \leq \sqrt[k]{3X}\} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=2}^{\lceil \log_2(3X) \rceil} \#\{\ell \in \mathscr{P}_\mathbb{Q} : \ell \leq \sqrt{3X}\} \\
&\leq \log_2(3X)[C\frac{\sqrt{3X}}{\log\sqrt{3X}}] = \tilde{C}\sqrt{X}
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $\tilde{C}$. At the same time by the Prime Number Theorem again we also know that for some positive constant $\bar{C}$ we have $\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}_K : \mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} \leq X\} \geq \bar{C}X/\log X$. Thus the upper density of $\mathscr{A}$ is

$$\limsup_{X \to \infty} \frac{\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{A} \,:\, \mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} \leq X\}}{\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{P}_K : \mathbf{N}\mathfrak{p} \leq X\}} \leq \limsup_{X \to \infty} \frac{\tilde{C}\sqrt{X}\log X}{\bar{C}X} = 0.$$

Hence $\mathscr{A}$ has a natural density, and it is zero. □

Proposition 8.3. *The set $\mathscr{V}_K(P)$ has natural density zero.*

Proof. We first observe that it was proven in [23] and [26] that the set

$$\mathscr{B} = \{\mathfrak{p}_\ell : \ell \in \mathscr{P}_{\mathbb{Q}} \wedge a_\ell = 1\}$$

has a natural density that is zero. Finally we note that $\mathscr{B} \cup \mathscr{A} = \mathscr{V}_K(P)$. □

REFERENCES

[1] Gunther Cornelissen, Thanases Pheidas, and Karim Zahidi. Division-ample sets and diophantine problem for rings of integers. *Journal de Théorie des Nombres Bordeaux*, 17:727–735, 2005.

[2] Gunther Cornelissen and Alexandra Shlapentokh. Defining the integers in large rings of number fields using one universal quantifier. To appear in Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov POMI.

[3] Gunther Cornelissen and Karim Zahidi. Topology of diophantine sets: Remarks on Mazur's conjectures. In Jan Denef, Leonard Lipshitz, Thanases Pheidas, and Jan Van Geel, editors, *Hilbert's Tenth Problem: Relations with Arithmetic and Algebraic Geometry*, volume 270 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 253–260. American Mathematical Society, 2000.

[4] Gunther Cornelissen and Karim Zahidi. Elliptic divisibility sequences and undecidable problems about rational points. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 613:1–33, 2007.

[5] Martin Davis. Hilbert's tenth problem is unsolvable. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 80:233–269, 1973.

[6] Martin Davis, Yuri Matiyasevich, and Julia Robinson. Hilbert's tenth problem. Diophantine equations: Positive aspects of a negative solution. In *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, volume 28, pages 323– 378. Amer. Math. Soc., 1976.

[7] Jan Denef. Hilbert's tenth problem for quadratic rings. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 48:214–220, 1975.

[8] Jan Denef. Diophantine sets of algebraic integers, II. *Transactions of American Mathematical Society*, 257(1):227– 236, 1980.

[9] Jan Denef and Leonard Lipshitz. Diophantine sets over some rings of algebraic integers. *Journal of London Mathematical Society*, 18(2):385–391, 1978.

[10] Kirsten Eisenträger. Hilbert's tenth problem for algebraic function fields of characteristic 2. *Pacific J. Math.*, 210(2):261–281, 2003.

[11] Gerald Janusz. *Algebraic Number Fields*. Academic Press, New York, 1973.

[12] H. K. Kim and F. W. Roush. Diophantine unsolvability for function fields over certain infinite fields of characteristic p. *Journal of Algebra*, 152(1):230–239, 1992.

[13] Serge Lang. *Algebraic Number Theory*. Addison Wesley, Reading, MA, 1970.

[14] Yuri V. Matiyasevich. *Hilbert's tenth problem*. Foundations of Computing Series. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1993. Translated from the 1993 Russian original by the author, With a foreword by Martin Davis.

[15] Barry Mazur. The topology of rational points. *Experimental Mathematics*, 1(1):35–45, 1992.

[16] Barry Mazur. Questions of decidability and undecidability in number theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 59(2):353–371, June 1994.

[17] Barry Mazur. Open problems regarding rational points on curves and varieties. In A. J. Scholl and R. L. Taylor, editors, *Galois Representations in Arithmetic Algebraic Geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[18] Barry Mazur and Karl Rubin. Ranks of twists of elliptic curves and Hilbert's Tenth Problem. arXiv:0904.3709v2 [math.NT].

[19] Thanases Pheidas. Hilbert's tenth problem for a class of rings of algebraic integers. *Proceedings of American Mathematical Society*, 104(2):611–620, 1988.
[20] Thanases Pheidas. Hilbert's tenth problem for fields of rational functions over finite fields. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 103:1–8, 1991.
[21] Thanases Pheidas. An effort to prove that the existential theory of $\mathbb{Q}$ is undecidable. In Jan Denef, Leonard Lipshitz, Thanases Pheidas, and Jan Van Geel, editors, *Hilbert's Tenth Problem: Relations with Arithmetic and Algebraic Geometry*, volume 270 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 237–252. American Mathematical Society, 2000.
[22] Bjorn Poonen. Elliptic curves whose rank does not grow and Hilbert's Tenth Problem over the rings of integers. Private Communication.
[23] Bjorn Poonen. Using elliptic curves of rank one towards the undecidability of Hilbert's Tenth Problem over rings of algebraic integers. In C. Fieker and D. Kohel, editors, *Algorithmic Number Theory*, volume 2369 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 33–42. Springer Verlag, 2002.
[24] Bjorn Poonen. Hilbert's Tenth Problem and Mazur's conjecture for large subrings of $\mathbb{Q}$. *Journal of AMS*, 16(4):981–990, 2003.
[25] Bjorn Poonen. Characterizing integers among rational numbers with a universal-existential formula. *Amer. J. Math.*, 131(3):675–682, 2009.
[26] Bjorn Poonen and Alexandra Shlapentokh. Diophantine definability of infinite discrete nonarchimedean sets and diophantine models for large subrings of number fields. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik*, 2005:27–48, 2005.
[27] Harold Shapiro and Alexandra Shlapentokh. Diophantine relations between algebraic number fields. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, XLII:1113–1122, 1989.
[28] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Diophantine undecidability for some function fields of infinite transcendence degree and positive characteristic. *Zapiski Seminarov POMI*, 304:141–167.
[29] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Extension of Hilbert's tenth problem to some algebraic number fields. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, XLII:939–962, 1989.
[30] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Diophantine undecidability of algebraic function fields over finite fields of constants. *Journal of Number Theory*, 58(2):317–342, June 1996.
[31] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Diophantine definability over some rings of algebraic numbers with infinite number of primes allowed in the denominator. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 129:489–507, 1997.
[32] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Defining integrality at prime sets of high density in number fields. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 101(1):117–134, 2000.
[33] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Hilbert's tenth problem for algebraic function fields over infinite fields of constants of positive characteristic. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 193(2):463–500, 2000.
[34] Alexandra Shlapentokh. On diophantine definability and decidability in large subrings of totally real number fields and their totally complex extensions of degree 2. *Journal of Number Theory*, 95:227–252, 2002.
[35] Alexandra Shlapentokh. *Hilbert's Tenth Problem: Diophantine Classes and Extensions to Global Fields*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
[36] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Diophantine definability and decidability in the extensions of degree 2 of totally real fields. *Journal of Algebra*, 313(2):846–896, 2007.
[37] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Elliptic curves retaining their rank in finite extensions and Hilbert's tenth problem for rings of algebraic numbers. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(7):3541–3555, 2008.
[38] Alexandra Shlapentokh. Rings of algebraic numbers in infinite extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$ and elliptic curves retaining their rank. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 48(1):77–114, 2009.
[39] Joseph Silverman. *The Arithmetic of Elliptic Curves*. Springer Verlag, New York, New York, 1986.

Department of Mathematics, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC 27858
E-mail address: `shlapentokha@ecu.edu`
URL: `www.personal.ecu.edu/shlapentokha`